

Previous references.

PLA 2542

10-5-04

File No.

52 of 03-04

✓
1904

(S & A)

Later references.

Papers filed in October same file no

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 182

PART B. FOR

August

SUBJECT.

Arrears of pay due to Ranga
Masalchi of the Devanhalli Taluk.

FILE No. 52 of 1903-04.

Arrears of pay due to Ranga, masalchi of the Devanhalli Taluk.

From the Revenue Commissioner, No. 8294, dated 18th June 1904.

Submits for sanction, as a special case, papers relating to a bill for Rs. 68-14-5, being the arrears of pay due to Ranga.

To the Revenue Commissioner and Comptroller, No. Fl. 1081-2, dated 26th August 1904.

Declines to sanction the bill involving extra cost to Government as the cost is the result of wrong arrangements made and directs that the cost be borne by the Officer who is responsible for them.

P. & A. 2542, dated
10th May 04.

Hand Rev. Secretaries

Office of the Dewan of Mysore.

File No. (if any)

Directions.

No., date and purport of receipts to be entered in red, and office note in black ink in order of dates.—To be written only on one side, and inside the line of margin.

Sl = ①

Office Note.

1

Branch Financial Branch.
(Pl & section)

Subject Letter No. 8294 dated the 18th June 1904 from the Revenue Commr in Mysore submitting for sanction a bill for Rs 68-14-5 being the arrears of pay due to Ranga Mashalchi of the Devanahalli Taluk, from 1st Nov 1901 to 15th Oct 1902.

The Comptroller states that the amount is not available and that the claim is inadmissible. The Revenue ~~the~~ Commr therefore recommends that the bill may be sanctioned, as a special case, under the ~~circ~~ ^{circs} stated by the Dy Commr in his letter No. R.C. No 340 of the 10th Feb 04.

Subd for orders.

DMB
29/6/04 Please put up GL No ^{11/11/04-52} 89-6-98
R7 159-93

as also the order on the authority of which the mojudars are stated to have been suddenly withdrawn from 1st Nov 1901. ^{encl} 30-6-04

This has evidently come from by mistake as it is not complete & is without a draft No. 17.1504

2
Galt Pro: No. 11444-52 d. the 9th
June 1878 is put up and denoted by
R. 7159-93
flag W

The other order is not traceable. It
seems that the Mojindars of the
Bangalore D^o were withdrawn
as those of the Tumkur D^o
were, under Galt Pro: No. 4497-505
R. 7159-93
d. 11th Decr 1900.

Subd

Mr

29/7/04

29/7
Runga was a Masalchi on the permanent Establishment
of the Devanahalli Taluk & was transferred as a peon to
work under the Taluk ~~Deputy~~ Mojindar engaged on the
Sub-division of Survey nos. G Pro 11444-52 29.6.1898
R. 7159-93

~~under which~~ which allowed peons to measure
distinctly stated that the peon should continue only so
long as the measurer continued to be employed in the
Rev Dept - As the measurer engaged on the work was
withdrawn on 1-11-1901 the peon should have also
reverted on the same date to his permanent appt in
the Taluk Estab^t, but this was not done & the
Amildar allowed the peon to work under the Taluk
Inspector. 2 ^{reasons are given} ~~reasons~~ to justify the retention of
the peon on the temporary Estab^t. First - the difficulty
of suddenly dispensing with the services of a permanent
hand and secondly misapprehension of the fact or -
The first difficulty is due to the mistake made
in transferring a permanent hand to a
temporary Estab^t and filling up permanently
his appointment in the D^o Estab^t -

General and Revenue
Secretariat.

File No. 52 of 1903

Serial
No.The second is not a good excuse as the Order to Clear
(68-14-5)The consequence is extra cost to Govt. which is now
regretted to be sanctioned as a special case.
Subd to the Secymem
20/7/02The offr that caused
the extra ^{charge} to bear it

3.8.1904

mem
3/8

Draft subd to the Secy

DMB
5/8/04mem
5/8/04 10/8/04Draft prepared
to

12.8.1904

2 Govt Pro: No. 71 1081-2 d. 26-8-04 to
SLA 52-03

the Div. Commr and the Camp holder

~~Directs that to the extent of pay~~ Declines
to sanction the bill involving extra cost to
Govt as the cost is the result of wrong
arrangements made and directs that
the cost be borne by the officer who is
responsible for them

Sl No (1)

No. 8294.

OFFICE OF THE REV. COMR. IN MYSORE,
Bangalore, 18 June 1904

FROM

T. Ananda Row Esq. B.A.
~~V. P. MADHAVA RAO, Esq. C.I.E.,~~
Revenue Commissioner in Mysore.

TO

The Secretary to the Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore,
General and Revenue Departments.

SIR,

I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of your No. P & A 2542 dated 10th May 1904 and to state that as therein requested, I forwarded to the Comptroller for verification and submission to Government for sanction the papers relating to a bill for Rs 68-14-5- being the arrears of pay from 1st November 1901 to 15th October 1902 due to one Ranga, Mashalchi of the Devanahalli Taluk, while he was working under the Tank Inspector of the Taluk engaged in the work of sub-division of survey Nos. The Comptroller returned the papers with his Docket No. 7030/1172 dated 9th June 1904 (copy herewith submitted for ready reference) stating that the pay of the Mashalchi of the Devanahalli Taluk was not available and that the claim is inadmissible. I therefore beg to recommend that under the circumstances stated by the Deputy Commissioner, the Government may be pleased to sanction the bill as a special case.

2. Copy of the Deputy Commissioner's letter No. R C 340 dated 10th February 1904 together with its enclosures received with your docket under reply are also resubmitted.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,



For Revenue Commissioner.


11
over 22/6

17A - 1864

1904.

From T. Ananda Row Esq. B.A.

~~V. P. MADHAVA IAO Esq. C.I.E.~~



To

The Secretary to Government of
H. H. the Maharaja of Mysore,
General & Revenue Departments.

Dated 18 }
Despatched 21 } June 04.
Received

General No. 8296
No.

ENCLOSURE No. Two, 1 bill &
V. P.

Submitting for sanction as a
special case papers relating to a
bill for Rs 68-14-5 being the ar-
rears of pay due to one Ranga
Mashalchi of the Devanahalli Taluk.

From

Offg: Comptroller of
Mysore.

To

T. Ananda Row Esq. B.A.

Revenue Commissioner
in Mysore.

Dated 9th June 1904.

Despatched

Received

7030

General No.

T.A.D. *g. A.* 1172

Enclosure No.

His No. 7317 dated 18th May 1904 forwarding for verification and transmission to the Secretary to Government, General and Revenue Departments, a bill for Rs 68-14-5 being the arrears of pay due to Mashalchi of the Devanhalli Taluk from November 1901 to October 1902 together with Bangalore District Deputy Commissioner's No. R C 340 dated 10th February 1904.

~~~~~

士

In reference to the above, has the honor to state that pay of Mashalchi of the Devanhalli Taluk was fully drawn and therefore not available for payment for any portion of the period referred to

referred to above i.e. from November 1901 to October 1902.


From the Deputy Commissioner's letter and the vernacular bill received it is however observed that the pay of a Measurer's peon attached to the Devanhalli Taluk was claimed by the Amildar of the Taluk. But as the entertainment of a peon does not appear to have been sanctioned by Government the claim is inadmissible.

The correspondence received with his letter under reference is herewith returned as this Office does not deal with expenditure not previously sanctioned.

Sd/ H. Eagles.

Offg: Comptroller.

"COPY"

  
For Revenue Commissioner.

A.N.



N.C. N<sup>o</sup> 340

Bangalore District  
Deputy Commissioner's Office.  
Bangalore 10<sup>th</sup> February 1902

From,

H.A. Parker Esq.

Deputy Commissioner

Bangalore District.

To.

V.P. Madhava Rao Esq. C.S.

Revenue Commissioner in Mysore

Sir,

I have the honor to state  
that in pursuance of Govt Proceedings  
N<sup>o</sup> 11444-52 dated 7<sup>th</sup> June 1898,  
N.D. 189-93  
one Banga, Masalchi, of an active  
and experienced person borne on  
the permanent establishment of the  
Devanahalli Taluk, was appointed  
as person on Rs 6/- to work under the  
Taluk Mojminder in place of the  
Sub Division of Survey N<sup>o</sup> and another  
~~who~~ was newly entered on Rs 5/- to  
do the Masalchi work. Subsequently  
when the Mojminders were all at  
a sudden withdrawn from 1<sup>st</sup>  
November 1901, the Amildar of  
Devanahalli

Serantham obtained permission  
of the Stamp Officer to fit the work  
of sub dividing Survey Nos then  
left unfinished in that Taluk  
done by the Tank Inspector. Thereon  
the Amildar instead of dispensing  
with the services of the peon attached  
to the Mozimidar, ordered him to  
<sup>under the impression that this work of the Tank Inspector</sup>  
work under the Tank Inspector, was  
only a continuation of the old  
Mozimidar work to help which the peon  
in question was originally sanctioned.  
When the Comptroller objected to pass  
the pay bill of the peon, he was taken  
back on the same pay to the perma-  
nent establishment of the Taluk  
wherein a vacancy occurred from  
the 16<sup>th</sup> October 1902.

2. The retention of the services  
of the peon referred to even after  
the Mozimidar was withdrawn  
seems to have been due partly to  
the difficulty of suddenly dispensing  
with

with the services of a permanent incumbent, who had put in long service and partly to the misapprehension of the Government order under which while the pay of the Mopunda was met by the Revenue Department that of this person was met from the Revenue Funds. The person has actually been working all the time and he is deprived of his pay during that period for no fault of his. I request therefore that this may be treated as a special case and the sanction of Government obtained for the arrears of pay due to him viz Rs 68/14/5 for the period during which he served under the Taluk Inspector and the bill for the same transmitted to the Comptroller for payment.

3. The bill amounting to Rs 68/14/5- together with the  
Vernacular

Personal file of papers is beautiful  
in briefest.

Thanks etc

~~SD~~ SD & Van Dyke's letter.  
For Defunct Comm?

"for"

Heavenly being

For Service Commission  
an. Wofford

Copy  
KAB

2

File No.

Serial No.

Diary No. of letter replied to PA 1864Proceedings of the Government of His Highness  
the Maharaja of Mysore.GENERAL AND REVENUE  
SECRETARIAT.( II )

READ.—

dated, the 26<sup>th</sup> August 1904Date of issue 26-8-04Signed by Mr M N Krishnaiah

Letter No. 8294 dated  
the 18<sup>th</sup> June 1904 from the  
Revenue Commissioner in  
Mysore Submitting the  
bill, received from the Dy  
Commissioner of the Bangalore  
District, for Rs 68-14-5  
on account of arrears of  
pay due to Ranga, Maskal  
chi of the Devanhalli  
Taluk from 1<sup>st</sup> Novr 1901  
to the 15<sup>th</sup> Octr 1902,  
while he was working  
under the Tank Inspector

over

SUBJECT

Conf

~~to~~ Inspector of the  
Taluk engaged in the work  
of ~~the~~ Sub-division of  
Survey numbers, and  
recommending that it  
may be sanctioned, as  
a special case, under  
the circumstances explained  
by the Dy Commr.

Order thereon No.  $\frac{76.1081-2}{517452-03}$  of 26 August 1901

Ranga was a  
mashelchi on the permanent  
establishment of the Devankalli  
Taluk and was transferred  
as a peon to work under  
the Taluk Mojmidar  
engaged on the Sub-division  
of Survey Nos. Gorkh B.

No. 11444-52 d. the 9<sup>th</sup>  
A.F. 159-93  
June 1898 which allowed

peons to measure distinctly  
stated that the peons

should continue only so

long as the measure<sup>as</sup> ~~was~~  
continued to be employed in the Rev. Dept. and there was no reason for any  
misconception of the intention of the order. X

GENERAL AND REVENUE  
SECRETARIAT.

(Continuation Sheet draft form.)

and the difficulty of suddenly dispensing with the services of a permanent incumbent who had put in long service is one of the reasons assigned for ~~such~~ the retention of the person. It should be explained why the place of Ranga who is stated to have been a permanent hand in the Devanahally Taluk Establish-<sup>ment</sup> was <sup>permanently</sup> filled up while he was only temporarily employed under the Taluk Mogildar, <sup>this rendering his reversion impossible</sup> and how the arrangements made have affected the pensionable service of the Masalechi. The extra cost is the result of the wrong arrangements made and it should therefore be borne by the officer who is responsible for them.

As the man engaged on this work was withdrawn on the 1<sup>st</sup> November 1901, the person should have also reverted on the same date to his permanent appointment in the Taluk establishment; but this was not done and the Amildar allowed the person to work under the Taluk Inspecting ~~owing to the difficulty of suddenly dispensing with the services of the permanent hand as his place in the <sup>Taluk</sup> establishment had been filled up permanently, ~~and~~ to the misapprehension of the Govt. order. The place of Ranga should not have been filled up on the Taluk establishment should not have been filled up, while he was temporarily employed under the Taluk Mogildar. The Govt. of H. H. the Maharaja deems it inexpedient to~~

12.8.1904

Secretary - num 2018/02

~~Sanction the extra charge  
incurred through the indis-  
cretion of the Amildar and  
direct that the charge be  
borne by the Amildar.~~

Secretary

to  
Muz  
5/8/04

To The Dev: Commr  
The Campbelle in Mysore